

Applic. No. 10/762,151
Amdt. dated June 29, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 13, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 29 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-32 remain in the application. Claims 1, 11, 12, 20, 21, and 32 have been amended. Claim 4 is being cancelled herewith. Claims 21-32 have been withdrawn from consideration.

In item 4 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, the Examiner requests that affirmation of the election to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-20 be made in response to the Office action. Affirmation to prosecute Group I, claims 1-20 is made herewith.

In item 6 on page 3 of the above-identified Office action, claims 11 and 12 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the limitation "at least one of said inner and outer joining locations together have an extent..." is indefinite because "together" contradicts the limitation "at least one". Claims 11 and 12

Applic. No. 10/762,151
Amdt. dated June 29, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 13, 2007

have been amended so as to further clarify the claims.

Therefore, the rejection has been overcome.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

In item 8 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1-4, 6-15, 17, 18, and 20 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Ota et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,486,338) (hereinafter "Ota") 1-4, 6-15, 17, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and as a whole, the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references. However, in order to facilitate prosecution of the application claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 4.

Applic. No. 10/762,151
Amdt. dated June 29, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 13, 2007

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1 and 20 call for, *inter alia*:

the sleeves having structures for compensation of changes in circumference of the honeycomb structure, and the structures of the inner sleeve and the structures of the outer sleeve engaging in one another and adjacent structures of the sleeves bearing at least partially against one another.

On page 5 of the Office action the Examiner alleges that Ota discloses "structures of sleeves (5, 7) engaging in one another and adjacent structures of said sleeves bearing at least partially against one another."

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegations are not correct. More specifically, Ota discloses that the cylinder (5) has a straight wall without any structures. Ota discloses that reference numeral "7" is a flat foil. Accordingly, Ota discloses that the flat foil (7) does not have any structures. Thus Ota does not disclose that the elements 5 and 7 have structures and that structures engage in one another and bear against adjacent structures. Therefore,

Applic. No. 10/762,151
Amdt. dated June 29, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 13, 2007

it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegations pertaining to structures of sleeves, is not correct.

As seen from the above given remarks, the reference does not show the sleeves having structures for compensation of changes in circumference of the honeycomb structure, and the structures of the inner sleeve and the structures of the outer sleeve engaging in one another and adjacent structures of the sleeves bearing at least partially against one another, as recited in claims 1 and 20 of the instant application. Ota discloses two cylinders that have flat surfaces. Ota does not disclose sleeves having structures. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the sleeves have structures for compensation of changes in circumference of the honeycomb structure, and the structures of the inner sleeve and the structures of the outer sleeve engage in one another and adjacent structures of the sleeves bear at least partially against one another.

Since claim 1 is allowable over Ota, dependent claims 2-3, 6-15, 17, and 18 are allowable over Ota as well.

In item 10 on page 7 of the Office action, claim 5 has been rejected as being obvious over Ota (U.S. Patent No. 5,486,338)

Applic. No. 10/762,151
Amdt. dated June 29, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 13, 2007

under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Since claim 1 is allowable, dependent claim 5 is allowable as well.

In item 11 on page 8 of the Office action, claim 16 has been rejected as being obvious over Ota (U.S. Patent No. 5,486,338) in view of Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0036427 A1) (hereinafter "Yamada") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Yamada does not make up for the deficiencies of Ota. Since claim 1 is allowable, dependent claim 16 is allowable as well.

In item 12 on page 9 of the Office action, claim 19 has been rejected as being obvious over Ota (U.S. Patent No. 5,486,338) in view of Wieres (WO 97/15393) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Wieres does not make up for the deficiencies of Ota. Since claim 1 is allowable, dependent claim 19 is allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 20. Claims 1 and 20 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Applic. No. 10/762,151
Amdt. dated June 29, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 13, 2007


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of
claims 1-3 and 5-32 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims
to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone
call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked
out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition
for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

June 29, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101